

Keep calm and carry on: Electrophysiological evaluation for reduced emotional anticipation stress in the second language

Jonczyk, R.; Korolczuk, Inga; Balatsou, Evangelia; Thierry, Guillaume

Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience

DOI:

[10.1093/scan/nsz066](https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsz066)

Published: 11/09/2019

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Jonczyk, R., Korolczuk, I., Balatsou, E., & Thierry, G. (2019). Keep calm and carry on: Electrophysiological evaluation for reduced emotional anticipation stress in the second language. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 14(8), 885-898.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsz066>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Keep calm and carry on

Electrophysiological evaluation of emotional anticipation in the second language

Rafał Jończyk^{1,2}, Inga Korolczuk³, Evangelia Balatsou³, and Guillaume Thierry³

¹*Faculty of English, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland*

²*Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, USA*

³*School of Psychology, Bangor University, UK*

Corresponding author:

Rafał Jończyk, PhD

Faculty of English

Al. Niepodległości 4

61-874 Poznań, Poland

e-mail: rjonczyk@wa.amu.edu.pl

telephone: +48 536 489 524

Authors' contributions:

R.J., G.T. designed research

R.J., I.K., E.B. collected the data

R.J., G.T. analysed the data

R.J., I.K., E.B., G.T. wrote the paper

Abstract

Investigations of the so-called 'foreign language effect' have shown that emotional experience is language-dependent in bilingual individuals. Response to negative experiences, in particular, appears attenuated in the second language (L2). However, the human brain is not only reactive, it builds on past experiences to anticipate future events. Here, we investigated affective anticipation in immersed Polish-English bilinguals using a priming paradigm in which a verbal cue of controlled affective valence allowed making predictions about a subsequent picture target. As expected, native word cues with a negative valence increased the amplitude of the stimulus preceding negativity (SPN), an electrophysiological marker of affective anticipation, as compared to neutral ones. This effect was observed in Polish-English bilinguals and English monolinguals alike. The contrast was non-significant when Polish participants were tested in English, suggesting a possible reduction in affective sensitivity in L2. However, this reduction was not validated by a critical language × valence interaction in the bilingual group, possibly because they were highly fluent in English, and because the affective stimuli used in the present study were particularly mild. These results, which are neither fully consistent nor inconsistent with the foreign language effect, provide initial insights into the electrophysiology of affective anticipation in bilingualism.

Keywords: Stimulus Preceding Negativity (SPN), Anticipation, Emotion, Foreign Language Effect, Bilingualism

Introduction

The human brain can be conceived as a prediction machine that builds upon prior experience to anticipate forthcoming sensory stimuli (Bar, 2007, 2009; Engel, Fries, & Singer, 2001; Van Berkum, 2010, 2013), construct emotional experiences (Barrett & Bar, 2009; Barrett & Simmons, 2015; Hoemann, Gendron, & Barrett, 2017), or make decisions (e.g., Lange & Fritsche, 2017; Summerfield & de Lange, 2014). A growing body of literature suggests that the brain goes well beyond being a reactive organ merely responding to incoming stimuli, and that it constantly prepares the resources needed to increase operational efficiency (Sterling, 2012). Electrophysiological studies of anticipatory processing have investigated slow waves that build up between the presentation of a warning stimulus (S1) and a target stimulus (S2), by comparing when S1 announces S2 and when it does not (Brunia, Hackley, van Boxtel, Kotani, & Ohgami, 2011). In classical threat-of-shock experiments, for instance, participants expect an electrical shock (S2) on the basis of a preceding warning (S1; e.g., Böcker, Baas, Kenemans, & Verbaten, 2001). An event-related brain potential modulation of particular interest in such S1–S2 paradigm is the CNV or Contingent Negative Variation (Walter, Cooper, Aldridge, McCallum, & Winter, 1964), consisting of an early phase reflecting attention to and processing of the warning stimulus, and a late phase, reflecting S2 anticipation and motor response preparation.

When S2 is highly evocative and arousing, e.g., when it has a high affective valence, the non-motor, late phase of the CNV takes the form of a negative drift, the stimulus-preceding negativity (SPN, Brunia, Boxtel, & Böcker, 2011; Brunia & van Boxtel, 2004; Kotani, Hiraku, Suda, & Aihara, 2001; Michalowski, Pané-Farré, Löw, & Hamm, 2015; Moser, Krompinger, Dietz, & Simons, 2009; Pei & Meng, 2016; Perri et al., 2014; Poli, Sarlo, Bortoletto, Buodo, & Palomba, 2007; Shafir, Schwartz, Blechert, & Sheppes, 2015; Thiruchselvam, Blechert, Sheppes, Rydstrom, & Gross, 2011; Zheng & Liu, 2015). SPN modulations have been reported in studies manipulating anticipation of phobia-related stimuli (e.g., Michalowski et al., 2015), painful stimuli (e.g., Böcker et al., 2001; Seidel et al., 2015; Swannell, Brown, Jones, & Brown, 2016), or aversive noise (Kotani et al., 2001).

Other studies have found an SPN amplitude increase when participants anticipate arousing, affective pictures (Moser et al., 2009; Perri et al., 2014; Poli et al., 2007; Takeuchi, Mochizuki, Masaki, Takasawa, & Yamazaki, 2005; Thiruchselvam et al., 2011). For example, Poli et al. (2007) measured the extent to which anticipation of negative and positive pictures would modulate SPN amplitude and heart rate. Participants were first presented with an affective (e.g., ‘blood’) or neutral (e.g., ‘people’) verbal cue preparing them for upcoming pictures of varying valence (positive, negative, neutral) and arousal (high arousal, low arousal). Irrespective of affective valence, SPN amplitudes increased and heart rate slowed down in anticipation of highly arousing pictures (e.g., erotic content or injuries) relative to low arousing pictures, even though Poli et al. (2007) used only 6 words as S1 cues. Swannell et al. (2016) also found that words associated with the concept of pain modulated participants’ anticipation of a heat stimulation delivered through a laser, when S1 presentation was subliminal, i.e., unconscious.

Here, we set out to investigate whether affective anticipation can be modulated by the language in which S1 is presented, within the same participants, and when S1 valence is matched between languages, in order to test the hypothesis of dampened emotional response when imbalanced bilinguals operate in their second language (Iacozza, Costa, & Duñabeitia, 2017; Jankowiak & Korpál, 2017; Jończyk, 2016a; Jończyk, Boutonnet, Musiał, Hoemann, & Thierry, 2016; Sheikh & Titone, 2016; Wu & Thierry, 2012; Baumeister, Foroni, Conrad, Rumiati, & Winkielman, 2017).

For instance, in a recent eye-tracking study, Iacozza et al. (2017) reported increased pupil dilation, indexing physiological arousal, in 27 Spanish–English bilinguals reading sentences with a negative connotation in Spanish, their native language (L1), as compared to English, their second language (L2). In the same vein, Jankowiak and Korpál (2017) asked 27 Polish–English bilinguals to listen to or read fragments that were negative (e.g., narrating someone’s death) or neutral (e.g., describing a city) in Polish or in English. When comparing English to Polish contexts, the authors reported decreased electrodermal activity in participants reading negative descriptions, but this was only found for reading as opposed to listening to the descriptions. These findings corroborate earlier electrophysiological evidence for reduced amplitudes of the N400, an electrophysiological index of semantic processing, selectively when negative information was presented in L2, whether in word pairs (Wu & Thierry, 2012) or naturalistic sentences (Jończyk et al., 2016). Thus, operating in the non-native language appears to provide late bilinguals with some kind of affective protection vis-à-vis negative emotional content. These findings provide neurophysiological support for bilinguals’ subjective reports about their emotional experiences in L1 and L2 in which the bilinguals’ L2 is often portrayed as being emotionally more distant, disembodied, or detached from early memories compared to their L1 (for reviews see Pavlenko 2012, Caldwell-Harris 2015, and Jończyk 2016a).

Other studies have reported effects consistent with the above reviewed results but in terms of a relatively greater sensitivity to positive information in L1, which can be considered the mirror image of reduced sensitivity to negativity in L2. For example, Hsu, Jacobs, and Conrad (2015) observed increased hemodynamic response to positive extracts from Harry Potter when these were presented to 24 German–English bilinguals in their L1 as compared to their L2. Gao, Zika, Rogers, and Thierry (2015) further showed that positive feedback delivered in Chinese to 16 Chinese–English bilinguals incited them to take 10% more risk in the following even-probability gambling trial, irrespective of amounts to be won or lost, whereas no difference was observed between positive and negative conditions when feedback was provided in English. Overall, despite the initial null results reported in electrophysiological studies of emotion-language interaction in bilinguals (Conrad, Recio, & Jacobs, 2011; Opitz & Degner, 2012), the evidence accumulated so far sways in favour of a moderating effect of the second language on emotional experience in late bilinguals.

However, previous studies showing dampened affective sensitivity in L2 stand in contrast to results from cognitive studies using behavioural paradigms such as the emotional Stroop task (Sutton, Altarriba, Gianico, & Basnight-Brown, 2007; Eilola, Havelka, & Sharma, 2007; Grabovac & Pléh, 2014; but see Winskel, 2013), the affective priming task (Degner, Doycheva, & Wentura, 2012), or the emotional word recall and recognition task (Ferré,

García, Fraga, Sánchez-Casas, & Molero, 2010; Ferré, Sánchez-Casas, & Fraga, 2013; but see Baumeister et al. 2017). Indeed, the latter studies have reported little or no difference in the automaticity of emotional word processing across L1 and L2 (for most recent reviews, see Caldwell-Harris, 2015; Jończyk 2016a).

In this study, we examined for the first time the neurophysiological effects of language of operation on anticipatory affective processing, that is, how the bilingual brain *prepares* for an upcoming emotional event. We employed the S1-S2 paradigm commonly implemented in studies of anticipation in combination with event-related brain potentials (ERPs) to investigate the relative amplitude of anticipatory potential variations elicited by stimulus cues (see Wu & Thierry, 2017, for a similar approach in the context of preparation for speaking). To our knowledge, only one study has previously investigated a possible interaction between affective anticipation and language of operation using physiological measures (García-Palacios et al., 2018). However, that study focused on language use (counting task), not semantic processing, and targeted physiological measures that are a proxy for stress levels in a fear conditioning context (pupil dilation and electrodermal activity).

In the present experiment, participants were presented with a negative, positive, or neutral verbal cue (S1), either in their L1 (Polish) or in their L2 (English). The cue predicted the valence and meaning of the target picture (S2) in 50% of trials. Following picture presentation, participants were asked to determine whether or not the target picture and verbal cue were related in meaning. Consistent with previous SPN studies (Moser et al., 2009; Ohgami, Kotani, Arai, Kiryu, & Inoue, 2014; Shafir et al., 2015; van Boxtel & Böcker, 2004), we focused on an early and a late time window of analysis to obtain a comprehensive picture of the anticipatory period preceding S2 presentation. We focused predictively on the relative impact of negative compared to neutral cues when late Polish-English bilinguals anticipated the display of emotional pictures, since positive stimuli usually afford less sensitivity.

Consistent with a hypothetical mechanism of repression (Wu & Thierry, 2012), we predicted more negative SPN amplitudes in both the early and late time windows of the SPN following a negative versus a neutral cue in L1 Polish but no such modulation for L2 English cues. We also recruited a group of monolingual English controls to ensure that the English stimuli would successfully elicit affective anticipation effects in native speakers of the language and thus expected to find SPN modulations in both the early and the late time windows in the group of native English speakers tested in English.

Methods

Participants

Twenty-one Polish–English bilinguals and 21 English monolingual speakers from the area of North Wales gave informed consent to take part in the study that was approved by the ethics committee of Bangor University, Wales, UK. Data from 4 bilingual and 3 monolingual participants were discarded due to insufficient number of clean EEG epochs per condition or excessive alpha contamination. This resulted in a final participant sample of 17 bilinguals ($M_{\text{age}} = 23.4$, $SD = 3.9$; 6 males, 11 females) and 18 monolinguals ($M_{\text{age}} = 24.4$, $SD = 2.7$; 12

males, 6 females). Except one ambidextrous monolingual participant, participants from both groups were right-handed. Also, all participants were residing in North Wales at the time of the experiment and reported having (corrected-to-) normal vision.

The bilingual participant group consisted of Polish native speakers who acquired English after puberty. All participants were immersed in the British culture at the time of testing but immersion time varied widely, from 3 months to 16 years ($M_{\text{immersion}} = 6.6$ years, $SD = 5.8$). Constraining participants selection on the basis of cultural exposure was not possible given the relatively small size of the Polish community in North Wales. The participants reported using both Polish and English on an everyday basis, in both formal and informal contexts. Their English proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening was self-reported using an adapted version of the Language History Questionnaire (LHQ) 2.0 (Li, Zhang, Tsai, & Puls, 2014; Table 1). The control monolingual participant group consisted of native English speakers who acquired English after birth and had limited exposure to other languages. Participants were compensated for their time with £12.

(Table 1 around here)

Stimuli

The experiment conducted with bilinguals comprised of 62 positive, 62 negative, and 124 neutral English words selected from an affective word database (Warriner, Kuperman, & Brysbaert, 2013), paired with 62 positive and 62 negative pictures taken from Google Image online Databases. The word-picture pairs were related or unrelated in meaning based on a pre-experimental norming study. Each word served as a cue to elicit anticipation of a subsequently presented picture in 4 affective cue-target combinations: negative word–negative picture, positive word–positive picture, neutral word–negative picture, and neutral word–positive picture. In each case, 62 combinations were related and 62 were unrelated. Unrelated pairs were created by repairing word cues and pictures within the positive and negative conditions and making sure through pre-experimental norming that no spurious relatedness randomly arose. Polish word cues were translations of the English word cues implemented by a highly proficient Polish-English bilingual with expertise in bi-directional Polish-English translation. To validate stimulus selection, all items were back-translated from Polish to English by six proficient Polish-English bilinguals who did not take part in the study: 85% of translations overlapped three or more times out of six. The remaining 15% yielded fewer stable translations, but most were closely related, or synonymous (e.g. ‘rich’ for ‘wealthy’, ‘tumour’ for ‘cancer’, ‘baby’ for ‘new-born’, etc.). Inter-rater agreement between translators was high ($ICC = .84$).

Zipf values for word lexical frequencies were collected from SUBTLEX-UK (van Heuven, Mandera, Keuleers, & Brysbaert, 2014) and SUBTLEX-PL (Mandera, Keuleers, Wodniecka, & Brysbaert, 2015) databases. In English, no significant differences were observed in lexical frequencies between positive ($M = 4.38$; 95% CI [4.21, 4.53]), negative ($M = 4.17$; 95% CI [4.0, 4.32]), and neutral ($M = 4.32$; 95% CI [4.20, 4.43]) words, $F_{(2,245)} = 2.05$, $p = .13$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Similarly, positive ($M = 3.9$; 95% CI [3.74, 4.06]), negative ($M = 3.68$; 95% CI [3.65, 3.84]), and neutral ($M = 3.77$; 95% CI [3.65, 3.88]) words in Polish did not significantly differ in lexical frequency, $F_{(2,245)} = 1.78$, $p = .17$, $\eta^2 = .01$; however, Polish

words ($M = 3.78$, ; 95% CI [3.7, 3.87]) were overall slightly less frequent than English words ($M = 4.29$; 95% CI [4.20, 4.37]), $F_{(1,494)} = 78.1$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .13$.

Ratings of valence and arousal for English words were obtained from Warriner et al. (2013). Valence differed significantly between positive ($M = 7.56$; 95% CI [7.4, 7.72]), negative ($M = 2.37$; 95% CI [2.21, 2.53]), and neutral ($M = 5.48$; 95% CI [5.37, 5.60]) words, $F_{(2,245)} = 1048$, $p_s < .001$, $\eta^2 = .89$. Arousal differed only between positive ($M = 5.15$; 95% CI [5.02, 5.49]) and neutral ($M = 4.0$; 95% CI [3.83, 4.16]; $p_{\text{bonf}} < .001$) as well as negative ($M = 5.26$; 95% CI [5.02, 5.49]) and neutral words, $p_{\text{bonf}} < .001$, with no difference between positive and negative words ($p_{\text{bonf}} = .1$). Based on post-experimental valence norming reported in a previous experiment with the same population (Jończyk, 2016b; Jończyk et al., 2016) and the fact that Polish words were direct translations of the English words, we assumed rough comparability in valence and arousal between languages. Nevertheless, we tested this assumption post-experimentally with a group of Polish speakers who did not take part in the experiment. The 248 Polish words used in the experiment were rated on valence and arousal on a scale from 1 to 9 (1 = highly negative/low arousing; 9 = highly positive/highly arousing) by 29 and 26 individuals, respectively. The scale and rating procedure followed Warriner et al. (2013), to ensure comparability between scales and instructions for further analysis. The scores obtained from this study and the database by Warriner et al. (2013) were subjected to two 3 (valence: positive; negative; neutral) \times 2 (language: Polish; English) by-item ANOVAs. The emotionality analysis revealed a main effect of valence, $F_{(2,490)} = 1982$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .89$, with significant differences between negative ($M = 2.32$; 95% CI [2.20, 2.43]), positive ($M = 7.39$; 95% CI [7.28, 7.50]), and neutral ($M = 5.4$; 95% CI [5.32, 5.48]) words, $p_s < .001$. The valence \times language interaction was non-significant, $F_{(2,490)} = 1.15$, $p = .30$, $\eta^2 = .01$. The arousal analysis revealed a main effect of valence, $F_{(2,490)} = 236.24$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .49$, with higher arousal ratings for negative ($M = 5.63$; 95% CI [5.47, 5.79]) and positive ($M = 5.35$; 95% CI [5.19, 5.52]) words relative to neutral words ($M = 3.6$; 95% CI [5.19, 5.52]; $p_s < .001$). Further, negative words were rated as marginally more arousing than positive words, at $p = .06$. Finally, the arousal analysis revealed a significant valence \times language interaction, $F_{(2,490)} = 26.95$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .09$, with higher arousal ratings for negative and positive words in Polish ($M_{\text{negative}} = 6.01$, 95% CI [5.77, 6.24]; $M_{\text{positive}} = 5.56$, 95% CI [5.32, 5.79]) relative to English ($M_{\text{negative}} = 5.26$, 95% CI [5.02, 5.49]; $M_{\text{positive}} = 5.15$, 95% CI [4.92, 5.38]), at $p_s < .001$. This effect was reversed for neutral words, with higher arousal ratings for neutral words in English ($M = 4.0$, 95% CI [3.83, 4.16]) relative to neutral words in Polish ($M = 3.37$, 95% CI [3.21, 3.54]), at $p = .02$. Note, however, that ratings for Polish stimuli were obtained from a group of Polish native speakers, while ratings for English stimuli were obtained from the database by Warriner et al. (2013), hence small differences across ratings were expected. For a graphical representation of valence and arousal ratings (**Fig. 1**).

Prior to the experiment, 174 participants rated 496 word—picture pairs for semantic relatedness on a scale from 1 (completely unrelated) to 7 (highly related). Unrelated pairs consisted of word-picture pairings in which the meaning of a word was not reflected in a picture; related pairs consisted of word-picture pairings in which the meaning of a word was reflected in a picture. To avoid word repetition, the pairs were counterbalanced across

participants so that each verbal cue appeared only once in each version of the norming study. This resulted in 4 different versions of the norming study, each containing 124 word—picture pairs. A 3 (cue: positive, neutral, negative) \times 2 (relatedness: related, unrelated) by-item ANOVA was run, with valence as a between-item factor, to assess potential differences in verbal cue-picture relatedness between pairs of varying affective valence. A main effect of relatedness was found, whereby related word–picture pairs were rated as more related ($M = 6.03$, 95% CI [5.94, 6.12]) than unrelated ($M = 2.01$, 95% CI [1.92, 2.10]) word-picture pairs ($F_{(1,490)} = 3648.8$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .87$). The interaction between word cue valence and relatedness did not reach significance, $F_{(2,490)} = .65$, $p = .52$, $\eta^2 = .0$, indicating that positive, negative, and neutral words did not significantly differ with regard to relatedness to target pictures.

(Figure 1 around here)

Finally, 38 participants rated 124 pictures on two affective qualities: valence and arousal. Valence was rated on a scale from -3 (very negative) to +3 (very positive) and arousal on a scale from 1 (neutral) to 5 (very arousing). A one-way by-item ANOVA demonstrated a significant main effect of valence whereby negative pictures were rated as significantly more negative ($M = -1.65$, 95% CI [-1.78, -1.50]) than positive pictures ($M = 1.69$, 95% CI [1.55, 1.80]; $F_{(1,122)} = 1134$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .90$). A second one-way by-item ANOVA found a significant main effect of arousal, with negative pictures rated as more arousing ($M = 3.17$, 95% CI [3.05, 3.29]) than positive ones ($M = 2.88$, 95% CI [2.75, 2.99]; $F_{(1,122)} = 11.1$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .08$). Overall, however, both positive and negative pictures were found to be moderate in terms of arousal. Finally, for the purposes of the experiment, the selected pictures were re-shaped in Adobe Photoshop CS6 to be 377×377 pixels, corresponding to a viewing angle of 5 degrees.

Procedure

Participants were seated 100 cm away from a CRT monitor in a dimly lit and quiet room. Following EEG cap preparation, during which they completed a short questionnaire, participants were familiarized with the task. They were told that in each trial they would see a verbal cue announcing a picture target. In half of the trials (124 per language), the verbal cue was affectively neutral and was followed by either a positive or a negative picture target. Thus, in this condition, the cue did not allow strong anticipatory effects to take place. In the other half of the trials, the verbal cue was positive (62 per language) or negative (62 per language), and it was followed by a picture target of the matching affective valence. Thus, when the cue was affectively arousing, it enabled affective anticipation to take place. Following a word cue, target pictures were either related (50%) or unrelated (50%). For instance, the word cue ‘accident’ could be followed either by a picture depicting a motorbike accident or by the picture of a slave. Participants were asked to indicate whether or not the picture was related to the preceding verbal cue by pressing one of two designated buttons. Participants were not explicitly informed about the emotional relationship between cue words and pictures.

The structure of a trial was as follows: The word cue announcing a target was presented for a random duration between 300–400 ms (in steps of 10 ms), followed by a fixation cross that remained on the screen for 3800 ms –the anticipation window. Subsequently, a picture was flashed for 200 ms and participants had to respond within 2300 ms. After every 10 trials a pink fixation cross was displayed for 5000 ms during which time participants could rest their eyes and blink as needed. Across the experimental session, each picture was presented twice to English native speakers and four times to Polish-English bilinguals. As for word cues, they were never repeated within language in English native speakers or across languages in Polish-English bilinguals.

Bilingual participants completed two blocks in English and two blocks in Polish. Languages were alternated between blocks; block order and response sides were counterbalanced between participants. Monolingual participants completed only two blocks of trials in English. Two researchers, one native speaker of Polish and one native speaker of English were present at all times, enabling a short exchange in the language of the forthcoming block after each pause.

EEG recording and analyses

Electrophysiological data were continuously recorded in reference to electrode Cz at a rate of 1000 Hz from 64Ag/AgCl electrodes placed according to the extended 10-20 convention. The vertical and horizontal electrooculograms (EOGs) were recorded from electrodes located above and below the right eye and at the outer canthus of each eye. Impedances were kept below 5 k Ω . EEG signals were amplified with Neuroscan SynAmps2 amplifier unit (El Paso, TX) and filtered online with a band pass filter between 0.05 and 200 Hz.

All pre-processing steps and analyses were performed using EEGLAB Toolbox (version 14.1.1; Delorme & Makeig, 2004) and ERPLAB Toolbox (version 6.1.4; Lopez-Calderon & Luck, 2014) in MATLAB (version R2017a, The Mathworks, Inc.). The signals were down-sampled offline to 250 Hz and all data were visually inspected for abnormalities. Sections of continuous data containing gross muscle artifacts were rejected. Abnormal channel activity was identified using the trimOutlier plugin (Lee & Miyakoshi SCCN, INC, UCSD) as well as by plotting channel spectra and maps in EEGLAB. No more than 4 channels were rejected per dataset in both the bilingual ($M = 1.32$; min = 0, max = 4) and monolingual ($M = 0.35$ min = 0, max = 2) participant groups. The rejected channels were interpolated using the spherical spline interpolation method. Next, continuous (non-segmented) data were digitally re-referenced to the average of all scalp electrodes (global average reference), excluding EOGs, and band-pass filtered between 0.1 and 30 Hz using a 2nd order infinite impulse response (IIR) Butterworth digital filter (slope: 12 dB/oct). Subsequently, the extended infomax Independent Component Analysis (ICA; Lee, Girolami, & Sejnowski, 1999) was run to correct for vertical and horizontal EOG artefacts. The independent components (ICs) were inspected using a semi-automated procedure. First, the IClab plugin (Pion-Tonachini, Kreutz-Delgado, & Makeig, 2019) was run to automatically classify ICs into broad source categories. Subsequently, selected ICs corresponding to artefactual activity originating in the eyes were visually inspected by plotting component activations. The mean number of rejected

ICs per participant amounted to 1.47 ($SD = .71$; min = 1, max = 3) in the bilingual and 1.66 ($SD = .59$; min = 1, max = 3) in the monolingual group. Prior to accepting ICA correction, we plotted the EEG data before and after ICA correction to make sure that rejecting ICs did not impact the data in an adverse way.

Following ICA correction, epochs were extracted from the continuous EEG. For SPN analysis, 4000 ms epochs were extracted, starting 200 ms before anticipation cue onset. For the N400 analysis, 1000 ms epochs were extracted, starting 200 ms before target picture onset. Baseline correction was applied relative to pre-stimulus activity. Epoch rejection was based on the result of a peak-to-peak moving window in ERPLAB (threshold: $\pm 80 \mu V$; window size: 200 ms; window step: 100 ms) and subsequent visual inspection. Table 2 and Table 3 present the mean number of accepted epochs per condition for the SPN (max = 62) and N400 (max = 124) analyses, respectively, in each participant group.

(Table 2 around here)

(Table 3 around here)

We focused on two ERP components: SPN, indexing anticipatory processes, and N400, indexing cue-picture integration; the ERP components were analysed predictively based on prior findings. SPN was analysed over three centrofrontal midline electrodes (AFZ, FCz, Fz) in two temporal windows, 800–1200 ms post-cue (early SPN) and 300 ms prior to picture presentation (late SPN; e.g., Moser et al., 2009); N400 was analysed over 9 electrodes (FC1, FCz, FC2, C1, Cz, C2, CP1, CPz, CP2) in the 350–500 ms time window (cf., Kutas & Federmeier, 2011).

Statistical analyses were conducted on mean SPN amplitudes in early (800-1200 ms) and late (3500-3800 ms) time window of predicted maximal sensitivity for early and late SPN, respectively. We first conducted repeated measures (RM) ANOVA on the SPN mean amplitudes in the bilingual group, with Language (Polish, English) and Valence (Negative, Neutral) as within-subject independent variables (we left the positive valence condition aside, given its commonly acknowledged reduced ability to elicit reliable SPN modulations). We then used planned comparisons by means of two-tailed paired t -tests to test the following predictions: (1) SPN amplitude should differ between negative and neutral anticipation conditions in Polish participants processing words in Polish; (2) the same contrast should be reduced in amplitude or cancelled when Polish participants **are** tested with English word cues; (3) SPN amplitude should differ between negative and neutral anticipation conditions in English participants processing words in English. Furthermore, (4) there should be an overall difference in SPN amplitude between English and Polish version of the experiment in Polish-English bilinguals, with more negative amplitude when testing was conducted in Polish than in English (Wu and Thierry, 2017). Note that we did not conduct a between-group comparison in this study because the conditions under which the two groups were tested varied in several ways (bilinguals knew two languages as opposed to only one, they underwent a double session comprising 4 blocks rather than 2, they saw 4 instances of each picture rather than 2, and they had to switch between languages across experimental blocks) making such a comparison invalid. Thus, English native speakers in this study were considered a control group to independently validate the English stimuli. Finally, (5) we

predicted a significant modulation of N400 amplitude elicited by picture targets when comparing unrelated vs related cue-picture pairs, irrespective of group or language, but we had no prediction as regards the direct comparison of Polish and English cue-picture pairs in Polish-English bilinguals. N400 analyses were performed on correct trials only by means of RM ANOVA with Relatedness (related, unrelated), Valence (negative, neutral), and Language (Polish, English) as within-subject independent variables.

Results

Polish-English bilinguals

SPN.

In the early SPN time window, the RM ANOVA revealed a main effect of valence, $F(1,16) = 7.6, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .32$, with more pronounced SPN amplitudes following negative ($M = -1.0 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.7, -.3]) rather than neutral ($M = -.6 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.4, .2]) word cues. Also, there was a main effect of language, $F(1,16) = 5.2, p = .04, \eta_p^2 = .24$, with more pronounced SPN amplitudes following word cues in English ($M = -1.1 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.9, -.3]) as compared to Polish ($M = -.5 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.4, .3]). The language \times valence interaction did not reach the significance threshold, $F(1,16) = 1.8, p = .2, \eta_p^2 = .10$.

In the late SPN time window, the RM ANOVA revealed a main effect of valence, $F(1,16) = 7.3, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .31$, with more increased SPN amplitudes following negative ($M = -1.3 \mu V$, 95% CI [-2.2, -.4]) rather than neutral ($M = -.77 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.5, .0]) word cues. Neither the main effect of language, $F(1,16) = 1.1, p = .3, \eta_p^2 = .1$, nor the language \times valence interaction, $F(1,16) = .3, p = .5, \eta_p^2 = .02$, turned out to be significant.

In the planned comparisons analyses, we found a significant modulation of the SPN amplitude in the early SPN window, with more pronounced SPN amplitudes in anticipation of a picture cued by a negative ($M = -.82 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.7, .07]) as compared to a neutral ($M = -.26 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.14, .63]) word in Polish, $t(16) = -2.4, p = .03$, Cohen's $d = .58$, but not in English, $t(16) = -.86, p = .40$, Cohen's $d = .20$. A similar result was found in the late SPN window, with more pronounced SPN amplitudes in anticipation of a picture cued by a negative ($M = -1.2 \mu V$, 95% CI [-2.2, -.26]) as compared to a neutral ($M = -.59 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.38, .20]) word in Polish $t(16) = -2.5, p = .02$, Cohen's $d = .61$, but not in English, $t(16) = -1.9, p = .08$, Cohen's $d = .46$ (see, **Fig.2**).

(Figure 2 around here)

(Figure 3 around here)

N400. The RM ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of relatedness, $F(1,16) = 46.5, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .7$, the N400 being more negative in response to pictures unrelated to the cue, $M = -.3 \mu V$, 95% CI [-1.4, .8], than those related to the cue, $M = 1.1 \mu V$, 95% CI [-.2, 2.3] (**Fig. 4**). N400 topography was asymmetric, with slightly greater amplitudes over the right hemisphere. Furthermore, neither the main effect of language, $F(1,16) = .9, p = .35, \eta_p^2 = .06$ (see, **Fig. 5**), nor the main effect of valence, $F(1,16) = 1.5, p = .26, \eta_p^2 = .08$, nor any of the interactions turned out to be statistically significant ($p > .05$).

(Figure 4 around here)

(Figure 5 around here)

English monolinguals

SPN. We found no significant differences between negative ($M = -2.88 \mu\text{V}$, 95% CI [-4.32, -1.45]) and neutral ($M = -1.97 \mu\text{V}$, 95% CI [-3.45, -.49]) cue conditions in the early SPN time window, $t(17) = -1.4$, $p = .18$, Cohen's $d = .32$. In the late window, SPN amplitude was more pronounced in anticipation of a picture cued by a negative ($M = -1.53 \mu\text{V}$, 95% CI [-2.03 - 1.03]) than a neutral ($M = -.81 \mu\text{V}$, 95% CI [-1.62, -.01]) word ($t(17) = -2.57$, $p = .02$, Cohen's $d = .61$; **Fig. 6**).

(Figure 6 around here)

N400. The RM ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of relatedness, $F(1,16) = 21.1$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .57$, the N400 being more negative in response to pictures unrelated to the cue ($M = .18 \mu\text{V}$, 95% CI [-.73, 1.1]) than those related to the cue ($M = 1.1 \mu\text{V}$, 95% CI [.3, 2.0]; **Fig. 7**). Neither the main effect of valence nor the relatedness \times valence interaction turned out to be significant ($p > .05$). In the similar vein to the bilingual group, N400 topography was asymmetric, with slightly greater amplitudes over the right hemisphere.

(Figure 7 around here)

DISCUSSION

We investigated whether the anticipation of emotional information is contingent upon the language of operation in bilinguals. We hypothesized that anticipating a negative picture cued by a negative word in L1 would lead to more pronounced amplitudes of the early and late SPN than when cued by a neutral word. Moreover, such difference would be significantly reduced or even fail to reach significance in L2. Electrophysiological data supported our hypothesis, showing increased amplitudes in the early and late SPN window in anticipation of pictures cued by negative words in the bilinguals' L1 (Polish) but not in their L2 (English). As expected, the same English words with a negative valence elicited enhanced SPN amplitudes in the monolingual English control group, the effect being restricted to the late SPN window. However, the predicted differences in the bilingual group occurred in the absence of a significant critical interaction between language and valence.

We contend that the absence of an interaction between language and valence in bilinguals relates to three characteristics of the present study that should be considered in the planning of future experiments. First, online activation of translation equivalents is likely to have played a role in reducing the size of such a potential interaction, given that access to translation equivalents has been shown to be unconscious and automatic in sequential bilinguals (e.g., Thierry and Wu, 2007, Wu and Thierry 2010). Even though such effects have also been shown to be reduced for negatively valenced words (Wu and Thierry, 2012), it must

be kept in mind that the bilinguals involved in the current study were highly proficient in English and immersed in an English speaking environment for an average of six years (range 3 months – 16 years). This means that language non-selective lexical access might have been more effective in the Polish-English bilinguals tested here than in a group of Chinese-English bilinguals having spent only a few months in the UK, for instance. And, indeed, the valence effect observed in bilinguals in the English cueing blocks was close to marginal ($p=0.08$). In other words, whilst the interaction may have been measurable in less balanced bilinguals or using a different paradigm (Jończyk et al., 2016), it may well be that non-selective language access in the current sample was too strong to allow the interaction to appear. In addition, the affective pictures selected for this study were particularly mild (see detailed discussion of this point below) compared to the kind of highly arousing stimuli used in SPN experiment previously (e.g., from the IAPS database, Lang et al. 1997). Finally, the experiment involved a high-level of stimulus repetition (picture targets were seen 4 times each by bilingual participants), which will have likely increased habituation effect (a factor known to reduce SPN sensitivity, Catena et al. 2012).

Taken together, our findings corroborate previous evidence showing that linguistic cues, particularly those of negative valence, can elicit affective anticipation effects (Swannell et al. 2016). Furthermore, this effect could be reduced in the L2 of bilinguals, suggesting that language may act as a modulating factor of affective anticipation (cf., Brunia, Hackley, et al., 2011; Kotani et al., 2017; Swannell et al. 2016; Poli et al. 2007). Future studies using less balanced bilinguals and more emotionally potent stimuli will hopefully confirm such modulation or discard it more clearly.

Previous studies on physiological anticipation often measured SPN at the FZ electrode site only (Fuentemilla et al., 2013; Morís et al., 2013; Moser et al., 2009; Pornpattananangkul et al., 2017; Thiruchselvam et al., 2011). Others reported more extensive scalp distribution covering the midline electrode sites (FPZ, FZ, FCz, Cz, CPZ, PZ, POZ; Poli et al. 2007). Here, we report a somewhat intermediate result, with SPN amplitude being maximal over AFZ, FZ and FCz. At least two methodological choices in the current experiment might have worked against a more widespread effect:

First, we elected not to rely on frequently used pictorial stimuli from affective picture databases (e.g., Dan-Glauser & Scherer, 2011; Lang, Bradley, & Cuthbert, 1997; Marchewka, Żurawski, Jednoróg, & Grabowska, 2014), because we considered such pictures too arousing and potentially disturbing, or in some cases even traumatizing. Beyond the potential ethical issues arising from the use of such stimuli, we made this choice because we wanted our results to be more ecologically valid and more representative of everyday functioning of the human brain. Indeed, one rarely witnesses lethal accidents or mutilations, and thus, results from studies that have used emotionally extreme stimuli might have artificially inflated the emotional response or even elicited responses that are not representative of everyday experience. Affective valence and arousal were therefore low in this experiment, as compared to the literature and thus the anticipation effects measured could be expected to be somewhat weaker. If the goal of future experiments is to establish reduced sensitivity in the second language to potentially traumatic stimuli, then experimenters might be advised to use far more

potent affective materials.

Second, we used a fully rotated, counterbalanced experimental design likely to have further weakened the strength of anticipatory processes. While this avoided the need for verbal cue repetition in each of the languages, picture repetition might have reduced SPN amplitudes through habituation. A few of the bilingual participants indicated that they had been able to guess the upcoming picture in some cases in the third and/or fourth experimental blocks. Given that the experimental sessions were approximately twice as long in the bilingual group, participants ended up being exposed to more repetition, which might have in turn reduced the anticipation effect to a greater extent. An alternative explanation is that our groups differed in affective suggestiveness. Future studies could use yoked control groups to test this possibility and more detailed psychometric measures may be needed to tap into between-group differences in general emotional sensitivity. Nevertheless, taking into account that the anticipation of uncertain outcomes tends to yield more intense experience (Catena et al., 2012), and considering that SPN amplitude tends to decrease as a function of learning (Morís et al., 2013), a potential valence-dependent effect of language on SPN amplitude could have been weakened in this study.

In line with previous studies of semantic processing in bilinguals, we found that SPN amplitudes were overall greater after an English than a Polish cue, which could be due to a partial overlap with the N400 component elicited by the cue, and generally consistent with the idea that processing information in the second language tends to require greater cognitive effort (Frenck-Mestre, 2002; Martin et al., 2013; Moreno & Kutas, 2005; Thierry & Wu, 2007). However, both early and late SPN modulations were observed well beyond the window of semantic processing, lending support to the fact that they did reflect anticipation of the target picture.

Moreover, we observed a language main effect in bilinguals, which could be interpreted as a sign of greater overall anticipation in L2 than in L1, or as a sign that when participants were exposed to L2 word cues their L1 was suppressed to a greater extent than their L2 when they were exposed to L1 word cues (an effect akin to that shown by Wu and Thierry, 2017, in the context of picture naming). If this differential suppression account is correct, then both negative and neutral words may have led to the inhibition of L1 when cues were in L2, with L2 inhibition being weaker for neutral than negative words when cues were in L1. Even though this leads to a slightly different interpretation of the results, this account remains consistent with greater affective sensitivity in L1 than L2.

Our findings suggest that highly proficient and immersed bilinguals operating in their second language may experience a reduction in sensitivity when anticipating affective content. This potential reduction, however, failed to yield a critical interaction in the current study unlike in previous studies showing that proficient bilinguals are less reactive to negative information presented in the second language, and appear ‘protected’ against its negative impact. For instance, in the study by Wu and Thierry (2012), Chinese-English bilinguals did not show a predicted priming effect relating to unconscious non-selective lexical access from English to Chinese (Thierry and Wu, 2007; Wu and Thierry, 2010) when the English prime word had a negative valence. In a more recent study using emotionally realistic sentence

contexts, access to negative information in the second language of immersed, proficient Polish-English bilinguals appeared to be reduced (Jończyk et al., 2016). Furthermore, converging observations based on pupil dilation (Iacozza et al., 2017) and electrodermal measurements (Jankowiak & Korpai, 2017; see also García-Palacios et al., 2018) lend support to the idea that individuals are more detached from emotionally charged information in the L2 (for a discussion of affective disembodiment in bilingualism, see Jończyk, 2016c; Pavlenko, 2012; Sheikh & Titone, 2016), at the same time providing neurophysiological support for findings reported in introspective and clinical bilingual contexts (cf. Pavlenko 2012, Caldwell-Harris 2015, Jończyk 2016a).

Despite the lack of a significant language by valence interaction in our bilingual group, our findings within each language context are not inconsistent with the so-called ‘foreign language effect’ (Keysar, Hayakawa, & An, 2012; Costa, Foucart, Arnon, et al., 2014). When bilinguals operate in their second language, they have been shown to exhibit a more utilitarian behaviour (Corey et al., 2017; Costa, Foucart, Hayakawa, et al., 2014; Costa et al., 2017; Geipel et al., 2015). Furthermore, late bilinguals are willing to take more risks when receiving positive feedback in their native language, that is a reduction of the hot-hand effect when they operate in their second language (Gao et al., 2015). The foreign language effect is thought to relate to the subjective impression of relative affective detachment when one operates in the second language, in line with hypotheses made on the basis of introspective approaches to bilingualism and emotion (for recent reviews, see Caldwell-Harris, 2015; Dewaele, 2010; Jończyk, 2016a) and bilinguals’ autobiographical memory (Larsen, Schrauf, Fromholt, & Rubin, 2002; Marian & Kaushanskaya, 2008; Pavlenko, 2014; Schrauf & Rubin, 1998, 2000).

CONCLUSION

In this study, we looked into effects of language of operation on the anticipation of a forthcoming emotional picture in a classical S1-S2 priming paradigm. ERP data provided evidence regarding the feasibility of a neurophysiological investigation of affective anticipation in bilinguals, given that a reliable SPN modulation was found in both bilinguals and monolinguals when they operated in their native language. Furthermore, our results suggest that emotional experience in the second language may be reduced in power, although this would require validation based on a within-subject interaction between affective valence and language of operation. Given the fact that participants in our study were very fluent in English and immersed in the L2 culture for a significant period of time, we believe that this difference may be more pronounced in less experienced bilinguals. Also, increasing the potency of emotional stimuli may lead to a significant within subject effect, but we are conscious that this may come at the cost of ecological validity.

Code availability. All MATLAB code used for the pre-processing of the data is available at Open Science Framework (OSF), <https://osf.io/tdzsk/>.

Data availability. The data collected and analysed for the purpose of the current study is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgment. In memory of Albert Costa. The authors would like to thank: Mina Jevtovic, Yang Li, Viktorija Liutkiene, and Bryan Watkins for assistance in data collection; Marta Nawrocka and Louise Thierry for assistance in stimulus preparation; Halszka Bąk and Cécile Barbet for support in norming data collection; Annett Schirmer for highly constructive editorial comments. The current project was supported by the grant from the National Science Centre in Poland: 2015/19/D/HS6/00591 (to RJ) as well as by the grant from the Foundation for Polish Science (FNP; to RJ).

REFERENCES

- Bar, M. (2007). The proactive brain: Using analogies and associations to generate predictions. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11(7), 280–289.
- Bar, M. (2009). The proactive brain: Memory for predictions. *Philosophical Transactions Of The Royal Society Of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 364(1521), 1235–1243. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0310>
- Barrett, L. F., & Bar, M. (2009). See it with feeling: affective predictions during object perception. *Philosophical Transactions Of The Royal Society Of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 364(1521), 1325–1334. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0312>
- Barrett, L. F., & Simmons, W. K. (2015). Interoceptive predictions in the brain. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, 16(7), 419–429.
- Baumeister, J. C., Foroni, F., Conrad, M., Rumiati, R. I., & Winkielman, P. (2017). Embodiment and Emotional Memory in First vs. Second Language. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00394>
- Böcker, K. B., Baas, J. M., Kenemans, J. L., & Verbaten, M. N. (2001). Stimulus-preceding negativity induced by fear: a manifestation of affective anticipation. *International Journal of Psychophysiology: Official Journal of the International Organization of Psychophysiology*, 43(1), 77–90.
- Brunia, C. H. M., Boxtel, G. J. M. van, & Böcker, K. B. E. (2011). Negative Slow Waves as Indices of Anticipation: The Bereitschaftspotential, the Contingent Negative Variation, and the Stimulus-Preceding Negativity. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195374148.013.0108>
- Brunia, C. H. M., Hackley, S. A., van Boxtel, G. J. M., Kotani, Y., & Ohgami, Y. (2011). Waiting to perceive: reward or punishment? *Clinical Neurophysiology: Official Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 122(5), 858–868. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2010.12.039>
- Brunia, C. H. M., & van Boxtel, G. J. M. (2004). Anticipatory attention to verbal and non-verbal stimuli is reflected in a modality-specific SPN. *Experimental Brain Research*, 156(2), 231–239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-003-1780-2>
- Caldwell-Harris, C. L. (2015). Emotionality Differences Between a Native and Foreign Language: Implications for Everyday Life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(3), 214–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414566268>
- Cano, M. E., Class, Q. A., & Polich, J. (2009). Affective Valence, Stimulus Attributes, and P300: Color vs. Black/White and Normal vs. Scrambled Images. *International Journal of Psychophysiology: Official Journal of the International Organization of Psychophysiology*, 71(1), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2008.07.016>
- Carretié, L., Hinojosa, J. A., Albert, J., & Mercado, F. (2006). Neural response to sustained affective visual stimulation using an indirect task. *Experimental Brain Research*, 174(4), 630–637. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-006-0510-y>

- Carretié, L., Hinojosa, J. A., & Mercado, F. (2003). Cerebral patterns of attentional habituation to emotional visual stimuli. *Psychophysiology*, 40(3), 381–388.
- Catena, A., Perales, J. C., Megías, A., Cándido, A., Jara, E., & Maldonado, A. (2012). The Brain Network of Expectancy and Uncertainty Processing. *PLoS ONE*, 7(7), e40252. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040252>
- Conrad, M., Recio, G., & Jacobs, A. M. (2011). The time course of emotion effects in first and second language processing: A cross cultural ERP study with German-Spanish bilinguals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 351. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00351>
- Corey, J. D., Hayakawa, S., Foucart, A., Aparici, M., Botella, J., Costa, A., & Keysar, B. (2017). Our moral choices are foreign to us. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 43(7), 1109–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000356>
- Costa, A., Foucart, A., Arnon, I., Aparici, M., & Apesteguia, J. (2014). ‘Piensa’ twice: on the foreign language effect in decision making. *Cognition*, 130(2), 236–254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2013.11.010>
- Costa, A., Foucart, A., Hayakawa, S., Aparici, M., Apesteguia, J., Heafner, J., & Keysar, B. (2014). Your morals depend on language. *PloS One*, 9(4), e94842. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094842>
- Costa, A., Vives, M., & Corey, J. D. (2017). On Language Processing Shaping Decision Making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(2), 146–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416680263>
- Cuthbert, B. N., Schupp, H. T., Bradley, M., McManis, M., & Lang, P. J. (1998). Probing affective pictures: Attended startle and tone probes. *Psychophysiology*, 35(3), 344–347.
- Cuthbert, B. N., Schupp, H. T., Bradley, M. M., Birbaumer, N., & Lang, P. J. (2000). Brain potentials in affective picture processing: covariation with autonomic arousal and affective report. *Biological Psychology*, 52(2), 95–111.
- Dan-Glauser, E. S., & Scherer, K. R. (2011). The Geneva affective picture database (GAPED): a new 730-picture database focusing on valence and normative significance. *Behavior Research Methods*, 43(2), 468–477. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0064-1>
- Degner, J., Doycheva, C., & Wentura, D. (2012). It Matters How Much You Talk: On the Automaticity of Affective Connotations of First and Second Language Words. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(1), 181–189.
- Delorme, A., & Makeig, S. (2004). EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *Journal Of Neuroscience Methods*, 134(1), 9–21.
- Delplanque, S., Lavoie, M. E., Hot, P., Silvert, L., & Sequeira, H. (2004). Modulation of cognitive processing by emotional valence studied through event-related potentials in humans. *Neuroscience Letters*, 356(1), 1–4.
- Delplanque, S., Silvert, L., Hot, P., & Sequeira, H. (2005). Event-related P3a and P3b in response to unpredictable emotional stimuli. *Biological Psychology*, 68(2), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2004.04.006>
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2010). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eilola, T. M., Havelka, J., & Sharma, D. (2007). Emotional activation in the first and second language. *Cognition & Emotion*, 21(5), 1064–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930601054109>
- Engel, A. K., Fries, P., & Singer, W. (2001). Dynamic predictions: oscillations and synchrony in top-down processing. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, 2(10), 704–716. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35094565>
- Ferré, P., García, T., Fraga, I., Sánchez-Casas, R., & Molero, M. (2010). Memory for emotional words in bilinguals: Do words have the same emotional intensity in the first and in the second language? *Cognition & Emotion*, 24(5), 760–785. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930902985779>

- Ferré, P., Sánchez-Casas, R., & Fraga, I. (2013). Memory for emotional words in the first and the second language: Effects of the encoding task. *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition*, 16(3), 495–507. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728912000314>
- Foti, D., Hajcak, G., & Dien, J. (2009). Differentiating neural responses to emotional pictures: evidence from temporal-spatial PCA. *Psychophysiology*, 46(3), 521–530.
- Frenck-Mestre, C. (2002). An on-line look at sentence processing in the second language. In R. R. Heredia & J. Altarriba (Eds.), *Bilingual sentence processing* (Vol. 134, pp. 217–236). Amsterdam, Netherlands: North-Holland/Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Fuentemilla, L., Cucurell, D., Marco-Pallarés, J., Guitart-Masip, M., Morís, J., & Rodríguez-Fornells, A. (2013). Electrophysiological correlates of anticipating improbable but desired events. *NeuroImage*, 78, 135–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.03.062>
- Gao, S., Zika, O., Rogers, R. D., & Thierry, G. (2015). Second Language Feedback Abolishes the ‘Hot Hand’ Effect during Even-Probability Gambling. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(15), 5983–5989. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3622-14.2015>
- García-Palacios, A., Costa, A., Castilla, D., Río, E., Casaponsa, A., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2018). The effect of foreign language in fear acquisition. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 1157. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-19352-8>
- Geipel, J., Hadjichristidis, C., & Surian, L. (2015). How foreign language shapes moral judgment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 59, 8–17.
- Grabovac, B., & Pléh, C. (2014). Emotional activation measured using the emotional Stroop task in early Hungarian-Serbian bilinguals from Serbia. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 61(4), 423–441. <https://doi.org/10.1556/ALing.61.2014.4.3>
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.
- Hoemann, K., Gendron, M., & Barrett, L. F. (2017). Mixed emotions in the predictive brain. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 51–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2017.05.013>
- Hsu, C.-T., Jacobs, A. M., & Conrad, M. (2015). Can Harry Potter still put a spell on us in a second language? An fMRI study on reading emotion-laden literature in late bilinguals. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior*, 63, 282–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.09.002>
- Iacozza, S., Costa, A., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2017). What do your eyes reveal about your foreign language? Reading emotional sentences in a native and foreign language. *PLOS ONE*, 12(10), e0186027. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186027>
- Jankowiak, K., & Korpál, P. (2017). On Modality Effects in Bilingual Emotional Language Processing: Evidence from Galvanic Skin Response. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-017-9552-5>
- Jończyk, R. (2016a). Affect-Language Interactions in Nonnative Speakers. In R. Jończyk, *Affect-Language Interactions in Native and Non-Native English Speakers* (pp. 75–101). Cham: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-47635-3_4
- Jończyk, R. (2016b). Affective Word Processing in Native and Nonnative English Speakers: A Neuropoetic Perspective. In R. Jończyk, *Affect-Language Interactions in Native and Non-Native English Speakers* (pp. 103–131). Cham: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-47635-3_5
- Jończyk, R. (2016c). Affective (Dis)Embodiment in Nonnative Language. In R. Jończyk, *Affect-Language Interactions in Native and Non-Native English Speakers* (pp. 149–159). Cham: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-47635-3_7
- Jończyk, R., Boutonnet, B., Musiał, K., Hoemann, K., & Thierry, G. (2016). The bilingual brain turns a blind eye to negative statements in the second language. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*.

- Keil, A., Müller, M. M., Gruber, T., Wienbruch, C., Stolarova, M., & Elbert, T. (2001). Effects of emotional arousal in the cerebral hemispheres: a study of oscillatory brain activity and event-related potentials. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 112(11), 2057–2068. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457\(01\)00654-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457(01)00654-X)
- Keysar, B., Hayakawa, S. L., & An, S. G. (2012). The foreign-language effect thinking in a foreign tongue reduces decision biases. *Psychological Science*, 23(6), 661–668.
- Kotani, Y., Hiraku, S., Suda, K., & Aihara, Y. (2001). Effect of positive and negative emotion on stimulus-preceding negativity prior to feedback stimuli. *Psychophysiology*, 38(6), 873–878.
- Kotani, Y., Ohgami, Y., Yoshida, N., Kiryu, S., & Inoue, Y. (2017). Anticipation process of the human brain measured by stimulus-preceding negativity (SPN). *The Journal of Physical Fitness and Sports Medicine*, 6(1), 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.7600/jpfsm.6.7>
- Kutas, M., & Federmeier, K. D. (2011). Thirty years and counting: finding meaning in the N400 component of the event-related brain potential (ERP). *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 62, 621–647. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.131123>
- Lang, P. J., Bradley, M. M., & Cuthbert, B. N. (1997). International affective picture system (IAPS): Technical manual and affective ratings. *NIMH Center for the Study of Emotion and Attention*, 39–58.
- Lange, F. P. de, & Fritsche, M. (2017). Perceptual Decision-Making: Picking the Low-Hanging Fruit? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 21(5), 306–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.03.006>
- Larsen, S. F., Schrauf, R. W., Fromholt, P., & Rubin, D. C. (2002). Inner speech and bilingual autobiographical memory: A Polish-Danish cross-cultural study. *Memory*, 10(1), 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210143000218>
- Lee, T.-W., Girolami, M., & Sejnowski, T. J. (1999). Independent Component Analysis Using an Extended Infomax Algorithm for Mixed Subgaussian and Supergaussian Sources. *Neural Computation*, 11(2), 417–441. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089976699300016719>
- Li, P., Zhang, F., Tsai, E., & Puls, B. (2014). Language history questionnaire (LHQ 2.0): A new dynamic web-based research tool. *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition*, 17(3), 673–680. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728913000606>
- Lopez-Calderon, J., & Luck, S. J. (2014). ERPLAB: An open-source toolbox for the analysis of event-related potentials. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00213>
- Mandera, P., Keuleers, E., Wodniecka, Z., & Brysbaert, M. (2015). Subtlex-pl: subtitle-based word frequency estimates for Polish. *Behavior Research Methods*, 47(2), 471–483. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0489-4>
- Marchewka, A., Żurawski, Ł., Jednoróg, K., & Grabowska, A. (2014). The Nencki Affective Picture System (NAPS): Introduction to a novel, standardized, wide-range, high-quality, realistic picture database. *Behavior Research Methods*, 46(2), 596–610. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0379-1>
- Marian, V., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2008). Words, feelings, and bilingualism. *The Mental Lexicon*, 3(1), 72–90. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.3.1.06mar>
- Martin, C. D., Thierry, G., Kuipers, J.-R., Boutonnet, B., Foucart, A., & Costa, A. (2013). Bilinguals reading in their second language do not predict upcoming words as native readers do. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 69(4), 574–588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2013.08.001>
- Michalowski, J. M., Pané-Farré, C. A., Löw, A., & Hamm, A. O. (2015). Brain dynamics of visual attention during anticipation and encoding of threat- and safe-cues in spider-phobic individuals. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 10(9), 1177–1186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsv002>
- Moreno, E. M., & Kutas, M. (2005). Processing semantic anomalies in two languages: an electrophysiological exploration in both languages of Spanish-English bilinguals. *Brain Research. Cognitive Brain Research*, 22(2), 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2004.08.010>

- Morís, J., Luque, D., & Rodríguez-Fornells, A. (2013). Learning-induced modulations of the stimulus-preceding negativity: Learning modulation of SPN. *Psychophysiology*, 50(9), 931–939. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12073>
- Moser, J. S., Krompinger, J. W., Dietz, J., & Simons, R. F. (2009). Electrophysiological correlates of decreasing and increasing emotional responses to unpleasant pictures. *Psychophysiology*, 46(1), 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2008.00721.x>
- Ohgami, Y., Kotani, Y., Arai, J.-I., Kiryu, S., & Inoue, Y. (2014). Facial, verbal, and symbolic stimuli differently affect the right hemisphere preponderance of stimulus-preceding negativity. *Psychophysiology*, 51(9), 843–852. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12234>
- Opitz, B., & Degner, J. (2012). Emotionality in a second language: It's a matter of time. *Neuropsychologia*, 50(8), 1961–1967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.04.021>
- Pavlenko, A. (2012). Affective processing in bilingual speakers: Disembodied cognition? *International Journal of Psychology: Journal International De Psychologie*, 47(6), 405–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.743665>
- Pavlenko, A. (2014). *The bilingual mind: and what it tells us about language and thought*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pei, G., & Meng, L. (2016). What do we expect from a beauty? Facial attractiveness of the opposite sex gives rise to discrepancies in males' anticipation and demand. *International Journal of Psychology: Journal International De Psychologie*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12393>
- Perri, R. L., Berchicci, M., Lucci, G., Cimmino, R. L., Bello, A., & Di Russo, F. (2014). Getting ready for an emotion: specific premotor brain activities for self-administered emotional pictures. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 8, 197. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00197>
- Poli, S., Sarlo, M., Bortoletto, M., Buodo, G., & Palomba, D. (2007). Stimulus-Preceding Negativity and heart rate changes in anticipation of affective pictures. *International Journal of Psychophysiology: Official Journal of the International Organization of Psychophysiology*, 65(1), 32–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2007.02.008>
- Polich, J. (2007). Updating P300: An Integrative Theory of P3a and P3b. *Clinical Neurophysiology : Official Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 118(10), 2128–2148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.04.019>
- Pollatos, O., Kirsch, W., & Schandry, R. (2005). On the relationship between interoceptive awareness, emotional experience, and brain processes. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 25(3), 948–962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.09.019>
- Pornpattananangkul, N., Nadig, A., Heidinger, S., Walden, K., & Nusslock, R. (2017). Elevated outcome-anticipation and outcome-evaluation ERPs associated with a greater preference for larger-but-delayed rewards. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 17(3), 625–641. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-017-0501-4>
- Schrauf, R. W., & Rubin, D. C. (1998). Bilingual autobiographical memory in older adult immigrants: A test of cognitive explanations of the reminiscence bump and the linguistic encoding of memories. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 39(3), 437–457. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1998.2585>
- Schrauf, R. W., & Rubin, D. C. (2000). Internal languages of retrieval: The bilingual encoding of memories for the personal past. *Memory & Cognition*, 28(4), 616–623. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03201251>
- Seidel, E.-M., Pfabigan, D. M., Hahn, A., Sladky, R., Grahl, A., Paul, K., ... Lamm, C. (2015). Uncertainty during pain anticipation: the adaptive value of preparatory processes. *Human Brain Mapping*, 36(2), 744–755. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22661>
- Shafir, R., Schwartz, N., Blechert, J., & Sheppes, G. (2015). Emotional intensity influences pre-implementation and implementation of distraction and reappraisal. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 10(10), 1329–1337. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsv022>

- Sheikh, N. A., & Titone, D. (2016). The embodiment of emotional words in a second language: An eye-movement study. *Cognition & Emotion*, 30(3), 488–500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2015.1018144>
- Spreckelmeyer, K. N., Kutas, M., Urbach, T. P., Altenmüller, E., & Münte, T. F. (2006). Combined perception of emotion in pictures and musical sounds. *Brain Research*, 1070(1), 160–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2005.11.075>
- Sterling, P. (2012). Allostasis: A model of predictive regulation. *Physiology & Behavior*, 106(1), 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.06.004>
- Summerfield, C., & de Lange, F. P. (2014). Expectation in perceptual decision making: neural and computational mechanisms. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 15(11), 745–756. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3838>
- Sutton, T. M., Altarriba, J., Gianico, J. L., & Basnight-Brown, D. M. (2007). The automatic access of emotion: Emotional Stroop effects in Spanish–English bilingual speakers. *Cognition & Emotion*, 21(5), 1077–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930601054133>
- Swannell, E. R., Brown, C. A., Jones, A. K. P., & Brown, R. J. (2016). Some Words Hurt More Than Others: Semantic Activation of Pain Concepts in Memory and Subsequent Experiences of Pain. *The Journal of Pain: Official Journal of the American Pain Society*, 17(3), 336–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2015.11.004>
- Takeuchi, S., Mochizuki, Y., Masaki, H., Takasawa, N., & Yamazaki, K. (2005). Stimulus preceding negativity represents arousal induced by affective picture. *International Congress Series*, 1278, 385–388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ics.2004.11.135>
- Thierry, G., & Wu, Y. J. (2007). Brain potentials reveal unconscious translation during foreign-language comprehension. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(30), 12530–12535. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0609927104>
- Thiruchselvam, R., Blechert, J., Sheppes, G., Rydstrom, A., & Gross, J. J. (2011). The temporal dynamics of emotion regulation: an EEG study of distraction and reappraisal. *Biological Psychology*, 87(1), 84–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2011.02.009>
- Van Berkum, J. J. A. (2010). The brain is a prediction machine that cares about good and bad—any implications for neuropragmatics. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 22(1), 181–208.
- Van Berkum, J. J. A. (2013). Anticipating communication. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 39(1/2), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tl-2013-0004>
- van Boxtel, G. J. M., & Böcker, K. B. E. (2004). Cortical Measures of Anticipation. *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 18(2/3), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.1027/0269-8803.18.23.61>
- van Heuven, W. J. B., Mandera, P., Keuleers, E., & Brysbaert, M. (2014). SUBTLEX-UK: A new and improved word frequency database for British English. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 67(6), 1176–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2013.850521>
- Vogel, E. K., & Luck, S. J. (2000). The visual N1 component as an index of a discrimination process. *Psychophysiology*, 37(2), 190–203.
- Walter, W. G., Cooper, R., Aldridge, V. J., McCallum, W. C., & Winter, A. L. (1964). Contingent Negative Variation : An Electric Sign of Sensori-Motor Association and Expectancy in the Human Brain. *Nature*, 203(4943), 380–384. <https://doi.org/10.1038/203380a0>
- Warriner, A. B., Kuperman, V., & Brysbaert, M. (2013). Norms of valence, arousal, and dominance for 13,915 English lemmas. *Behavior Research Methods*, 45(4), 1191–1207. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-012-0314-x>
- Winkel, H. (2013). The emotional Stroop task and emotionality rating of negative and neutral words in late Thai-English bilinguals. *International Journal Of Psychology: Journal International De Psychologie*, 48(6), 1090–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2013.793800>

- Wu, Y. J., & Thierry, G. (2012). How Reading in a Second Language Protects Your Heart. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(19), 6485–6489. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6119-11.2012>
- Wu, Y. J., & Thierry, G. (2017). Brain potentials predict language selection before speech onset in bilinguals. *Brain and Language*, 171, 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2017.04.002>
- Zheng, Y., & Liu, X. (2015). Blunted neural responses to monetary risk in high sensation seekers. *Neuropsychologia*, 71, 173–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.04.002>

Fig 1. Violin plots of valence (A) and arousal (B) ratings for English and Polish word cues. Shapes represent density estimates and horizontal lines represent inter-quartile range (25%, 50%, 75%). NEG, words with negative valence words, NEU, neutral words, and POS, words with positive valence.




Fig 2. Event-related potentials elicited by neutral and negative (top), neutral and positive (middle), and positive and negative (bottom) L1 Polish (left) and L2 English (right) cues in the bilingual group. Waveforms illustrate brain potential variations computed via linear derivation from 3 midline frontal electrodes (AFZ, FZ, FCZ). The window of analysis started just after verbal cue presentation, coinciding with the display of a fixation cross. The shaded areas highlight the window(s) of significant differences. Black dots on the topographical maps depict the electrode sites of interest. Bar graphs represent mean SPN amplitude averaged over the electrodes of interest in each condition in the early (left panel) and late (right panel) SPN window. Error bars depict 95% confidence interval.




Fig 3. Event-related potentials elicited by cue language in the bilingual group. Waveforms illustrate brain potential variations computed via linear derivation from 3 midline frontal electrodes (AFZ, FZ, FCZ). The window of analysis starts just after verbal cue presentation, coinciding with the display of a fixation cross. The shaded area highlights the window of significant differences. Black dots on the topographical maps depict the electrode sites of interest. Bar graphs represent mean amplitude averaged over the electrodes of interest in the early (left panel) and late (right panel) SPN window. Error bars depict 95% confidence interval.




Fig 4. ERPs elicited by picture targets (S2) as a function of relatedness with the preceding verbal cue (S1) in the bilingual group. Waveforms illustrate brain potential variations computed via linear derivation from 9 centro-parietal electrodes (FC1, FCz, FC2, C1, Cz, C2, CP1, CPZ, CP2). Time 0 coincides with picture presentation onset. The shaded area highlights the window of significant differences. Black dots on the topographical maps depict the electrode sites of interest. The bar graph represents mean N400 amplitude averaged over the electrodes of interest in the window of analysis. Error bars depict 95% confidence interval.




Fig 5. ERPs elicited by picture targets (S2) as a function of the language (L1 Polish or L2 English) of the verbal cue (S1) in the bilingual group. Waveforms illustrate brain potential variations computed via linear derivation from 9 centro-parietal electrodes (FC1, FCz, FC2, C1, Cz, C2, CP1, CPZ, CP2). Time 0 coincides with picture presentation onset. Black dots on the topographical maps depict the electrode sites of interest. The bar graph represents mean N400 amplitude averaged over the electrodes of interest in the window of analysis. Error bars depict 95% confidence interval.






Fig 7. ERPs elicited by picture targets (S2) as a function of relatedness with the preceding verbal cue (S1) in the monolingual group. Waveforms illustrate brain potential variations computed via linear derivation from 9 centro-parietal electrodes (FC1, FCz, FC2, C1, Cz, C2, CP1, CPZ, CP2). Time 0 coincides with picture presentation onset. Shaded grey areas highlight the window(s) of significant differences. Black dots on the topographical maps depict the electrode sites of interest. The bar graph represents mean N400 amplitude averaged over the electrodes of interest in the window of analysis. Error bars depict 95% confidence interval.




Table 1. Bilingual participants' self-rated proficiency in English.

Measure	Score
Overall	7.75 [1.2]
Reading	7.83 [1.9]
Writing	7.52 [1.7]
Speaking	7.52 [1.5]
Listening	7.82 [1.1]

Proficiency was measured with a 10-point Likert scale where 1 = *very poor*, 10 = *native-like*. Square brackets represent s.d.m.

Table 2. The mean number of accepted epochs per each condition for the SPN analysis in each group.

Condition	Bilingual	Monolingual
Negative English	58.8 [57.6, 60.1]	58.8 [56.6, 60.9]
Positive English	59.0 [57.6, 60.4]	57.8 [55.3, 60.3]
Neutral English	58.8 [57.6, 60.0]	56.8 [54.0, 59.4]
Negative Polish	58.9 [57.7, 60.1]	N/A
Positive Polish	59.3 [58.3, 60.2]	N/A
Neutral Polish	59.1 [57.9, 60.3]	N/A

Square brackets represent 95% CI values.

Table 3. The mean number of accepted epochs per condition for the N400 analysis in each group.

Condition	Bilingual	Monolingual
Related English	96.1 [90.5, 101.7]	91.9 [86.5, 97.3]
Unrelated English	103.1 [97.6, 108.6]	95.5 [88.1, 103]
Related Polish	96.9 [92.1, 101.8]	N/A
Unrelated Polish	104.5 [100.2, 108.8]	N/A

Square brackets represent 95% CI values.